DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 615 CG 014 100

AUTHOR Hyman, Irwin A.
TITLE Psychology, Education and Schooling: Social Policy Implications in the Lives of Children and Youth.
PUB DATE 3 Sep 79
NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (87th, New York, NY, September 1-5, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Children: Educational Improvement: *Educational Policy: Educational Theories: *Policy Formation: *Psychology: *School Policy: Social Factors: State of the Art Reviews: *Youth

ABSTRACT

An overview is presented of the conceptualization of interaction between psychology as a profession, and science and education. A brief history indicates psychology lacks the ability to make a major impact on policy regarding education. Problems of improving schooling are discussed, within the context of American culture with special reference to the economy, social justice, the generation gap, punitiveness towards children, the crisis mentality in funding and the sickness model for providing psychological services in the schools. (Author/BMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PSYCHOLOGY, EDUCATION AND SCHOOLING: SOCIAL POLICY IMPLICATIONS IN THE LIVES OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH[1]

Irwin A. Hyman[2]

Temple University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Irwin A Hyman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED182615

American social policy towards children and youth is without question the single most important factor determining the quality of life for children in our society. Because of the complexity of our post-industrial society and the immensity of government, social policy reaches to the very roots of family, religious and individual life styles. There are revolutionary changes in recent decades which have been shaped by court decisions and legislation, but these must all be understood within the long-term historical context of America's "official" and "unofficial" agendas for children. Perhaps the single most influential, disappointing and disruptive force shaping the outcome of social policy towards children is the discrepancy between the American myth and American reality. I have written frequently about the discrepancy between what we believe we think we do for our children and what we actually do to them (Hyman, 1978). However, today I would like to take this opportunity to share with you a somewhat broader perspective of the relationship between psychology, education, schooling and my own particular interpretation of important factors shaping social policy considerations.

CG 014100

---

[1]Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York City, September 3, 1979. This paper is an expanded version of a paper with the same title which will be published in the American Psychologist in the Fall of 1979.

[2]The writer acknowledges the contributions of Eric Gladfelter, Sandra Gorter-Cass and Gloria Senatore who reviewed the literature for parts of this paper.

I will begin by briefly demonstrating what I feel are specific linkages between psychology and education, followed by an attempt to differentiate between education and schooling. The remainder of this presentation will deal with broad aspects of policy which I feel need to be conceptualized differently if the American educational enterprise is to survive as a positive force for bringing our peoples together in a common commitment to improve the quality of life for all citizens. I believe that there is no single solution for education that exists outside the boundaries of the major social forces within our society. It is only fair to warn you that most conclusions which follow are undoubtedly affected by my own social and political beliefs. But then, that is the style in which social policy outcomes are really determined.

Psychology and Education

While some may fail to appreciate the relationship between pedagogy and psychology, it is apparent that the two disciplines have been inextricably intertwined throughout Western history. Historically, psychology was considered a suspecialty within philosophy. The works of the founders of modern psychology focused on exploring learning, human development, and social interaction. All are issues of major concern to educators. The early techniques of psychophysics and studies of perception, learning, sensory processes, and symbolic process are all related to everyday happenings in classrooms. Yet the contributions of Wundt, Titchener, Tolman, Guthrie, Thorndike, Lewin, and others are rarely recognized and even less often considered systematically and knowledgeably by policy planners, administrators or classroom teachers.

Most educators are familiar with Pavlov's dogs and Skinner's pigeons. Yet when one observes a modern classroom and the materials used therin, it

is obvious that more than a few of the most widely recognized psychologists have had an impact on the lives of children. Courses, teaching materials, and techniques based on the works of psychologists are all part of the training and continuing education of teachers. Research by educational psychologists is beginning to yield substantive information to improve the teaching process (Gage, 1978).

For other examples of the impact of psychology upon education, one might examine the many psychological journals which publish research and opinion directly related to education. Further, major experimental programs in education such as Head Start, Follow Through, Open Education, and various approaches to special education have all received theoretical and applied input from American psychology. Psychologists such as John Gardner, Kenneth Clark and Edward Zigler have held important national policy making positions affecting the lives of school children.

But, before we become overzealous in our self congratulations, it is important to ask one questio: why is it, with all the psychological knowledge available and the aforementioned influence, that American education is almost always in trouble? Why does educational theory and practice change so often, engendering a public lack of faith in education as a systematic organized body of knowledge? One reason is that while psychology as a science has been able to contribute to the educational process, psychology as a profession has had relatively little consistent and long-range impact on policy making and implementation. We are experiencing the scientist/humanist dilemma personified by J. Robert Oppenheimer who helped create a force over which he lost control when policy decisions became involved. We have created potentially useful concepts such as I.Q., behavior modification, and self actualization, yet somehow these concepts get turned

around and are used in ways that harm children. Whenever psychology as a science develops new concepts, new approaches to problem solving, or innovative strategies for teaching, the panacea mongers among policy makers in education, the public, and psychology act as if the final truth has been discovered. Because of public pressure, those in policy making positions often take a good idea and apply it "ad absurdum." This process is exacerbated by bureaucrats and inspector generals who transform policy into ritualized and homogenized procedures. For example, one may only consider the results of the once well begun experiment in competency based teaching. This has become a lumbering monstrosity that is completely out of control and is now plaguing the lives of educators and academicians despite lack of empirical evidence for its validity.

There is so much potential good in what psychology has to offer, yet there has been a serious lack of effective interface between psychology, education and the public in the area of social policy planning for schools. Of even greater concern is the American public's attitude and actions in regard to education, schooling and behavioral science and scientists. There is a common belief among many types of scientists that we have quite limited potential to shape public policy. Yet in a book entitled "Scientists in Power," Spencer Weart (1979) "challenges the notion of the political inefficacy of scientists" (Goodell, 1979). He describes the political effects of French nuclear physicists around World War II. Weart demonstrates from his history that "much of the power to influence technology rests with the decisions and actions of individual scientists" (Goodall, 1979).

Of course in comparison to the physical sciences, behavioral scientists tend to believe they really have little to offer, and less that will be

accepted by policy makers. Yet Michael Saks (1978) in an article in the American Psychologist demonstrates the range of knowledge that a social psychologist has to offer physicians, judges and legislators in dealing with specific policy determinations involving the esoteric ethical and legal problems of human organ transplantation. He states "except in the dreams of some psychologists and the delusions of others, the makers of social policy make little use of behavioral science knowledge or behavioral scientists" (Saks, 1979). While a few prominent, respected and/or charismatic educators or psychologists may have some effect on actual educational outcomes, rarely is this the result of systematic and rational application of social science working in tandem with policy making to benefit a grateful public. In fact, social psychological literature indicates that power and information flow along informal social pipelines and the "old boy network."

Whether or not social scientists have, can, or will make a real difference in social policy in the lives of children remains an unanswered question. Therefore, I will now turn to the major issues which need to be addressed at the interface between psychology, education and social policy planning.

Education and Schooling in America

Modern American Education is well described as a

> "relatively weak profession, badly divided within itself and not yet embodying the core of professional values and knowledge required to resist fads, special-interest groups and--perhaps most serious of all--funding influences." (Goodland, 1979, p. 342).

It is too often dependent upon local elections for economic support and is weakened by political struggles which determine state and federal aid. Further, few in policy making positions understand the difference between

education and schooling. Education has to do with the process of learning; schooling is the means by which social, political and economic factors shape the learning environment. As mentioned previously, American psychology has contributed tremendously to knowledge concerning the learning process but the contribution to schooling has been quite limited.

One of psychology's major responses to the needs of children in terms of learning and schooling has been the development of a specialty called school psychology. Unfortunately, school psychology has been an estranged cousin of both the scientific and professional communities in psychology (Hyman, 1979). In part, this has resulted from psychology's inadequate understanding of schooling. Further, there is a traditional lack of respect for American education, educators and colleges of education. Also there has been a preoccupation of practicing professional psychologists with establishing a separate identity free from medicine. The struggle of psychologists to become independent health providers has led to the adoption of a generic definition for professional psychology. While there are specialty requirements which differentiate clinical, counseling, and school psychology, under the generic standards an individual must hold the doctorate in order to be considered a professional psychologist within the American Psychological Association's definition. The intractability of many leaders of American psychology and their limited understanding of the realities of schooling have resulted in the disenfranchisement of many school psychologists. As a result, the National Association of School Psychologists was organized, in effect providing a separate identity for the majority of school psychologists and removing them from the mainstream of American Psychology.

In 1978, only six training programs in school psychology were accredited by APA. It is ironic, therefore, that the graduates of numerous non-accredited programs are the very people who form the everyday interface between the public and American psychology. School psychologists are the professionals who work with children, parents, educators, and community leaders. They determine the public's image of psychology for many parents, especially parents of exceptional children. What they do well and do poorly on behalf of children has a strong influence on the development of court cases, legislation and public sentiment about how helpful psychology is for children. For instance, what has psychology or school psychologists to say about the voucher system currently being considered in California. This voucher movement may have a profound affect on American education. These are issues of schooling to which all psychologists need to attend.

An Example of Benign Neglect in Schooling

The controversy over the use of I.Q. tests in schools is illustrative of the kinds of problems which have developed from the benign neglect of school psychology. This is concomitant with psychology's inattention to problems of schooling and policy planning. Alfred Binet might well be considered the first school psychologist, not only because of his psychometric and developmental innovations, but more importantly because of his success in using social science as a tool to carry out governmental policy in education. It must be remembered, despite current controversies over the concept of labeling and I.Q., that Binet's tests were developed to help educators decide an appropriate curricula for children. However, it was in America that the real concept of individual differences took solit root. For good and bad, the concept of I.Q. came to form the nexus for the interface of psychology as a science and psychology as an applied profession within the house of education.

While psychology as a profession has continued to pay considerable attention to the many theoretical and measurement issues involved in the concept of intelligence, it has devoted little attention to the fact that people called school psychologists are daily administering tests which provide labels having profound effects on the lives of children. Only recently has American psychology begun to act in a concerted corrective effort, then, only as a result of court actions and legislative mandates which were provoked by education related problems of I.Q. testing, but which now affect all of psychology. It is amazing that several generations of psychologists have been trained without understanding how I.Q.'s are used by policy makers to further bigotry, isolationism, racism and elitism. Part of the problem is that those cautious scientists and careful professionals who always understood the limitations of I.Q. scores, especially as single determinants for diagnosis, were ineffective or uninterested in reaching the policy makers who structured schooling in America.

While American psychology has not adequately recognized the insidious use of I.Q. scores to implement immoral social policy, the history in some other countries is not much better. The well known and for the most part discredited research of Sir Cyril Burt was extensively quoted to support theories of eugenics which had profound implications on the lives of children in England (Dorfman, 1978). His theories on heredibility of intelligence were major factors in determine public policy in education. In fact, the British Education Act of 1944

> "enshrined Burt's divisive, hierarchial principals. In many parts . . . [of England] . . . the structure Burt advocated is little, if at all changed" (Gillie, 1979, p. 27).

Now we are witnessing a pendulum swing typical in education whereby many want to eliminate I.Q. testing completely. In fact, some wish to

eliminate all testing. The N.E.A., an important lobbying group, is straining its credibility and inviting attacks from the Right. For instance, Andrew Greeley, in one of his syndicated columns discussing declining reading scores, berates educators after claiming that the

> "bottom dropped out . . . [of academic standards] . . . mostly because American secondary school teachers and principals became reluctant to insist on academic performance in the name of serving the special needs of minorities . . . . Professional educators are beginning to demand the elimination of standardized tests. If tests show that schools are doing a bad job, the solution seems to be not to improve the work of the school but to abolish the tests--much like the ancient custom of lopping off the head of the herald who brings bad news" (Greely, 1979, p. D3).

Of course, Greely refuses to deal with the real problems of the economy, social justice, broken homes, and a myriad of factors which affect learning, let alone the actuality of a real decline in education. But he does reflect the political backlash of the public as a result of N.E.A.'s ill founded drive to eliminate testing. The obvious consequence in the classroom would be to depend on teacher's subjective judgments to make important decisions affecting children's lives. This alternative, especially for many minority children, is even less palatable than testing, when past experience is examined. Despite the limitations and abuses of testing, objective testing systems have provided the opportunity for upward mobility for countless lower class persons who have been able to utilize egalitarian principles inherent in our meritocracy. I.Q. tests and related assessments have helped to identify gifted children who would have otherwise lost significant educational opportunities. I.Q.'s have been used to prevent countless children from being placed in classes for the retarded when teachers and administrators felt children belonged there because of low achievement. Assessment of intelligence has helped psychologists to differentiate between behavioral and intellectual difficulties and to plan appropriate educational experiences to help remedy both types of problems.

Often the well trained school psychologist is stymied by the politics of schooling in America and prevented from offering the broad range of services possible because of social policy limitations. Despite the wealth of psychological research, theory, and data available from developmental, experimental, social, and other branches of psychology, the politics of schooling prevent formulation of a sensible plan for the gradual systematic development of the practice of education. In fact, rather than accumulating wisdom and prestige, American education constantly appears to be deteriorating as it flaps and flutters in the changing winds of political and economic uncertainty. And the interface between psychology and education, whether it be at the experimental or professional level, can never provide a solid base for improvement in many children's lives until schooling becomes less susceptible to the whims of the many forces impacting it. Important policy issues are affected by many forces, some of which are outlined in the remainder of this paper. These factors require the careful attention of those psychologists willing to become involved in changing schools.

The Economy and Social Justice

Americans often forget that schools can only be a reflection of a society and not the light that leads it. There seems to be an unsupportable mystique that schools will solve our problems of poverty, chronic unemployment, racism, and stress. This is one of our most dangerous myths. Furthermore, we have devised a system in which schools become the public lightning rod for taxpayers' frustration over economic instability, inflation, recession, and disgust with government in general. In my own 22 years of experience in education, I have seen the popularity and support of schools to be a direct function of economic factors which pervade all aspects of

our culture. During that time, I have never perceived a greater danger to the public school system than it presently faces. And I believe that it is in large part due to an economy that feeds racism, ethnocentricism, bigotry and all the meaness which can be evoked from the dregs of society. Despite democratic principles which support pluralism, the role of the schools as a leveler and integrator of all groups for common support of constitutional principles has at best been marginal, but it has been effective to sustain our form of government. Now even that marginal role is in danger.

It is evident that the present system of capitalism based purely on productivity and profit needs to be altered if schools are to become a stable and important force in our society. We need to develop an economic model which places individual satisfaction and health adjustment into the equation. We cannot hope for social justice in the larger society and expect them to receive it in the schools. All of the efforts to eliminate labeling of children, to stop testing minorities by a common standard and to make believe individual differences do not exist will come to naught if our basic economic outlook is not changed. Somehow the capitalistic stress on productivity and competition leads to an emphasis on grades, labeling, and tracking in education; an emphasis which result in large numbers of children feeling alienated and diminished in worth. Many of these, as adults, turn against the educational system by voting down adequate school budgets and encouraging their own children's alienation from the schools. In short, social justice and quality education for all children are totally dependent upon the economy.

Despite judicial and legislative reform, attempts to equalize educational opportunity have really not worked. A study of four tax reform

states by the Rand Corporation indicates that even though property tax discrepancies have become fewer, the end result is that the proper schools remain poor (Trenton Times, June 3, 1979). Some of the poorer districts may be even worse off than before since their per-pupil spending still lags behind the wealthier districts, but their taxes have increased. Generally, the old saying that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is still applicable. The core of the problem is related to the myth that we live in a free enterprise system in which all have an opportunity to get ahead. While there are exceptions to the rule, it just isn't so (deLeon, 1979). And the discrepancy between the promise of the myth and the reality of the world is reflected in the actions and hearts of every American who keeps reaching deeper into his or her savings to stay ahead of inflation.

A new economic model must redefine productivity, while still retaining those features of capitalism which encourage individualism and free enterprise within a socially responsible context. Some policy makers and economists such as Milton Friedman cling to the belief that our economic system truly reflects a free marketplace in which egalitarian principles enable all citizens to compete equally. The expectations of this myth engender a system of destructive competition which is reflected in the schools.

In preparing this paper, I consulted with several economists and assigned a graduate student to review the literature to investigate the existence of economic models based on concepts of productivity which rely on mental health, adjustment and/or happiness and enlightenment of citizens. A perhaps not exhaustive review reveals little evidence of econometric models of the type mentioned. While it is obvious that the Western world has not lacked for philosophers, sociologists and utopian dreamers, there have also been serious individual students of the topic, perhaps

starting with Max Weber, who have attempted to resolve the problems of individual happiness and productivity within the context of industrialized society.

From different perspectives, economists such as Epstein, Alperovitz and Maitel have begun to look at the economy from an interdisciplinary viewpoint, with emphasis on understanding the contributions of behavioral science. To date, much of the interdisciplinary efforts have focused on personality and motivational factors. For instance, work by Maital and associates have used psychological and economic techniques to study risk taking, delayed gratification, income distribution and tax evasion (Filer, Maital & Simon, 1978).

As early as the 1960's, a group of international planners realized the failures of their attempts to raise the standards of living in Third World countries with the recognition that "formulation of economic objectives purely in terms of economic growth is not sufficient." (Epstein, 1975). In terms of policy planning, Fry and Winters (1970) suggest that purely political variables exert little or no influence on policy outcomes which seemed to be overwhelmingly governed by socioeconomic forces.

I do not pretend to know the answer to the problem of the economy and social justice. I am certainly not willing to give up the opportunities offered by free enterprise but the myth that is exists is even more damaging in the long run to schooling. After two decades of the anti-poverty programs and the war on poverty, it is obvious that the present structure has done relatively little to change the quality of life in the ghettos and poverty stricken rural areas. I do not think the basic model is that bad, it just has not been given a real chance.

I am not the first to suggest that one answer for poor whites, blacks, Hispanics and others may lie in the model of the Kibbutz. A cooperative

model for educating children, providing a stable work atmosphere and the dignity gained in contributing should not be rejected. This model answers many of the realities of American life which are shrouded in our media perpetuated myths. A full explanation of this approach cannot be presented here, but suffice it to say most of the present solutions for the resolution of a just society will not come about without appropriate economic support.

In conclusion to this section, it might be mentioned that psychologists from many specialty areas have organized a third force called the Public Interest Coalition, which is beginning to have important impact within the politics of American psychology. This group consists of behavioral scientists and professional practitioners who are cognizant of the public policy implication of psychological data. They represent a point of view emphasizing an economic model based on human factors in addition to those factors which have determined our gross national product. For example, productivity should not be eliminated from the equation; productivity is too important to be measured simplistically by how many cars come off the assembly line. A society's productivity should also be measured by how few people are institutionalized, by how few persons are illiterate, and by how little juvenile delinquency occurs. It also should be measured by how many talented, gifted, and idealistic young people are nurtured towards satisfying and rewarding professions of benefit to all of society. This model may provide the checks and balances needed to reorient our values and economy and may thereby revive a faltering educational system which otherwise appears to have a very poor prognosis. Within the public sector, the public interest coalition reflects the beginnings of what may be an important third political party, The Consumer Party. This alone could tip the political scale.

Finally, the economy, the possibility for social justice and the future of our country are very much tied up with what we do to young adults, especially those who are poor. This leads to the next section which deals with our myths related to the discrepancy between how we tell young people to act and how we really expect them to act.

The Generation Gap

A major problem in our post-industrial society is the existence of an alienated, infantilized, and disliked group of citizens called adolescents. The many theoretical explanations for the existence of this group in our society will not be reviewed here. It is clear now that large numbers of young adults are adversely affected by social policy and education. Many young adults, especially those from minority and low income populations, are unemployed and unemployable. That there is a growing problem cannot be denied, and that it is related to social policy decisions and implementation is easily apparent. By way of illustration, consider the following statistics presented by Edward Wynne which appeared in a new journal entitled Character and reported to the public by Albert Shanker (1979). Both Shanker, Wynne and some of the writers associated with this journal appear to be rather conservative, but the editors are calling for an interdisciplinary approach to what seems to be deteriorating conditions in adolescence:

> "'Between 1959 and 1976, the rate of death by homocide of white males aged 15 to 19 rose from 2.7 per thousand members of the age group to 7.5. This is a 177% increase. In particular, the rate increased each year between 1969 and 1975.' The rate for black males in the age group is much higher and has also risen but has shown some decline between 1969 and 1975."
>
> "The annual suicide rate of white males aged 15 to 19 increased 260% between 1950 and 1976."
>
> "Surveys indicate greatly increased drug use by the young. One survey showed that in 1975, 18.2% of males said they used mari-

juana before the 10th grade. In 1977 that had increased to 30.6%. There is also evidence that there have been similar increases in the use of serious drugs."

"Surveys also show vast increases in the use of alcohol by youths. A San Mateo survey 'reported that the percentage of seventh-grade boys who began drinking the previous year increased from 52% in 1969 to 72% in 1973.' Other surveys show that San Mateo is not atypical, and that the alcohol is not merely being tasted, for 'in 1974, 24.1% of a national sample of youths between 13 and 18 reported being drunk four or more times during the past year.'"

"'Between 1950 and 1976, the estimated number of illegitimate births for unmarried white females, aged 15 to 19, went from 5.1 per thousand to 12.4 . . . during a period characterized by increasing availability of contraceptives, abortions and sexual information.'"

"Between 1956 and 1975 reported cases of gonorrhea rose more than 200%, syphilis 100%, amont 15- to 19-year-olds, in spite of 'increased availability of medicine, treatment centers, and appropriate prevention information.'" (Shanker, 1979)

I believe that many, if not most, of the problems of youth stem from conditions of poverty, forced inactivity, infantilization, alienation and consequent hostility.

As one approach to the problem I favor the establishment of a National Voluntary Youth Service Agency. This would borrow the good ideas from the Peach Corps, VISTA, CETA and other similar programs. However, it would be greatly expanded and offer the opportunity for useful training, education, work and recreation experiences both part and full time for every youth from approximately fourteen years of age and older. Entry age would not be associated with chronological age but maturational level. The policy implications in relation to schools, unions, industry, etc. would be vast, as would initial expenditures. Organizational aspects should minimize federal control and maximize local options through public schools that would meet standards established by a national bipartisan advisory panel (if it were possible to establish such a group). I believe the establishment of a successful program would, in the long run, be the most cost effective

action ever taken by our people in order to cut the social costs which result from the alienation of youth.

A particularly perplexing and sometimes puzzling myth in our society has to do with the usefulness of a college education. Contrary to historical beliefs, recent mythology in America indicates a belief that a college education does not really make a difference in monetary rewards. A significant segment of the public has begun to believe that colleges may be necessary evils which offer only entry level credentials into the work world. This message has been accepted by many policy makers. This has been translated into a growing anger at intellectuals and undervaluing of thinking. Colleges and universities are being turned over to accountants and business managers who look only to cost benefits and that perverted statistical conceptualization called credit generation. These approaches show little regard for programmatic concerns. Despite the myth, a recent study by Jenks still indicates that people with college educations make more money than people without (New York Times, August 12, 1979, 22 E). But that is not really the issue, since the goal of education in a free society is to provide an enlightened public. The myths and realities of a college education and public policy are extensive. In fact, we really do not act as if the more educated citizens we have the more our society will benefit. If we did we would provide a free education for every citizen up to the level of his or her ability to benefit society. An examination of the current cost of education will reveal that a whole generation of recent college graduates are mortgaged because of the expense of their education. It is not uncommon for college graduates to face adulthood with oppressive debts of ten to twenty thousand dollars resulting from loans needed to complete their education. We used to believe that an educated citizenry con-

tributed to the prosperity of a democracy; yet now, young people are told that they must go into heavy debt in order to obtain a college education, even though their productive work lives will help our economy to grow and therefore benefit all of us. I think this is a major disgrace and a festering problem which will have severe impact for many decades.

The public response by policy makers has generally been to reflect a rather punitive attitude. Almost all of the literature on college loans has focused on the defaulters and how to collect. But why is the rate of default high?

Nine months following graduation, students are expected to being repaying their loans over a maximum ten-year period. Being saddled with a $10,000 to $15,000 debt shortly following graduation may be too cumbersome for many graduates who are experiencing unemployment or underemployment, which is currently a frequent situation. Students find themselves faced with debts for an education which has not provided the wealth and prestige of the job that was envisioned.

The beginning of one's career is also the point in time when one generally is paid the least. This is the least probable time of repayment since one has less money. Joseph Norcera (1977) wrote a brief story describing his problems with trying to meet payment schedules. The young Washington news reporter writes, "At my age (25) you pay your dues, and dues never made anyone rich. It is not, then, the best of times to be saddled with a hefty debt."

And finally, there are always going to be those who never intended to repay or do not feel any sense of responsibility to pay for their education. However, somehow it seems somewhat ludicrous to speak of people "stealing an education."

If we are not to provide universal free education perhaps a more palatable solution would involve repayment based on some percentage of a graduate's income, as suggested originally as "income contingent" lending. Yale and Duke Universities began such an approach in 1971 (Paying for Schools & College, 1976).

A complete exploration of the topic of funding education is of course beyond the scope of this presentation. Problems such as vouchers as are being considered in California. This approach offers some solutions but perhaps there would be worse eventual results. However, of even greater concern is the process in which we go about providing funds for education, which leads to the next topic to be briefly considered.

The Crisis Mentality in Funding

Much educational innovation results from legislation setting up a chain of grant and funding deadlines that absolutely preclude success. When crises arise and politicians become aroused, their response is often immediately to spend great sums of money for short periods of time in order to attempt to resolve long existing problems that just happen to have surfaced. For instance, as this article is being written, the problem of school violence and vandalism is being attacked with a 1.5 million dollar national 18-month effort of amelioration. A more realistic approach would involve 1.5 billion dollars and a twenty or thirty-year effort with well defined short and long-range goals. These and other programs are doomed from the start. Perhaps a new Department of Education could solve this problem. But it is naive to think that reorganizing the same bureaucracy will make a difference unless Congress changes its procedures for funding education. What is needed in a long-term, stable source of funding not tied to property taxes and short-term grants?

Because of funding deadlines, school administrators are constantly under the gun to devise programs and submit grants "yesterday." Yet psychologists have been in the forefront for evaluation of many of these programs and know that is is difficult to demonstrate effectiveness because of their overwhelming complexity. Our knowledge and abilities should not be used to line our pockets with evaluation and consultation contracts, but to convince policy makers of the futility of crisis funding.

The Sickness Model in Schooling

Millions of dollars are spent yearly for mandated psychological services to school children, yet almost all of this sum is devoted to diagnosis, treatment, and remediation. No state or federal regulation of which I am aware mandates a role for psychologists in a primary prevention model. This situation parallels the dichotomy in the health professions. Traditionally, medicine has supported a sickness rather than a prevention model. As a result, federal, state, and private funding is used primarily for diagnosis and treatment. Primary prevention still has low financial priority in both health and education. We must convince legislatures that money invested in developing "healthy" learning atmospheres will improve schooling. There is certainly a substantial data base, if not common sense, to support the assumption of a primary prevention model. Just as medicine is turning to models of health maintenance stressing regulr examinations and prevention as a way to cut health costs and improve functioning, schools need to develop an Educational/Psychological Maintenance Plan. Head Start, though limited in resources and often poorly administered because of bureaucratic insolence, incompetence and contradictory mandates, offers an ideal model for the development of a systems approach. This model views the child as a part of a total family and community system

which needs enrichment in order for the child to become a "healthy" learner. However, even Head Start is handicapped by paradoxical philosophies and competing resources which appear to be inherent in the federal bureaucracy. One component of the program stresses primary prevention in mental health while another, because of federal regulations, requires psychologists to identify, diagnose, label, and plan for all handicapped children. Yet few, if any, local Head Starts have the financial resources to do both. It is clear that within the foreseeable future the prevention model will never be adequately tested.

Punitiveness of Social Policy

Punitiveness in the schools is a major problem in this decade. In recent years, nine out of ten of the Gallup Polls regarding education indicate that respondents have felt that discipline was and is the major problem in schools (Gallup, 1978). The Safe Schools Study indicated that while there was an increase of violence and vandalism in the 1960's, this trend has leveled off in the 1970's (National Institute of Education, 1977). However, despite some improvement in urban schools "the risk of violence to teenagers is greater in school than elsewhere, when amount of time spent at school is taken into account" (National Institute of Education, 1977, p. 2).

The public's response to children's misbehavior has become more and more punitive (Hyman, 1978). While the reasons for this are too extensive to discuss here, it is obvious that the results will not benefit children. The Supreme Court denied school children constitutional protection from paddling, thus, for many, legitimizing this practice even in the home (Hyman, 1978). Our policy of hitting children is a factor which many believe has contributed to an excessive amount of child abuse. Psycholo-

gists have impressive evidence against the use of punishment as a primary method of changing and shaping behavior. We need to convince policy makers that it is in the national interest to educate parents and school personnel in the many positive methods of socializing children. This should be done through a concerted effort by the media. I have thought an especially effective method would be to develop spot commercials depicting typical developmental and behavioral problems with alternatives for solutions. This could even be accompanied by commercial sponsorship.

Summary and Conclusions

Within the limits of this essay-editorial, I have attempted to offer a brief historical sketch of the relationship between psychology and education. I have noted the development of school psychology existing at the interface between the two and have discussed some problems that psychology, as a profession and a science, has to deal with in order to have a more effective, positive impact on the lives of children. However, as noted in the final section of this paper, I believe that despite the efforts and good intentions of child advocates, there are broader societal changes to consider. The International Year of the Child offers a fine but so far disappointing format in which to reconsider our policies concerning how we educate and nurture our children in American society.

In conclusion, it appears that this year is a year in which American policy makers should reconsider their commitment to Public Education. Fred Hechinger (1979), an outstanding educational columnist, is extremely alarmed about the decline of our schools. I strongly favor his recommendation for the establishment of a national coalition for public education which would have as its goal the "propogation of faith in public schools as the foundation of American democracy" (Hechinger, 1979, p. 22). This

would be a non-partisan council of leaders which would avoid involvement in debate of educational theories and focus on the importance of all education. It would be temporary and therefore disband when its goal is reached. For if policy toward schooling does not change we may well be left with an educational system squeezed of vitality with two educational strata separated "along lines of class and wealth" (Hechinger, 1979, p. 22).

References

A degree does count. The New York Times, August 12, 1979, 22E.

DeLione, P. Small futures. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jonowicz, 1979.

Dorfman, D. D. The Cyril Burt question: new findings. Science, September 29, 1978, 201, 1177-1186.

Filer, R., Maital, S. and Simon, J. Risk taking and risk aversion: a game simulation of stock market behavior. (Research Memorandum No. 28, Department of Economics, Princeton University), Princeton, NJ, 1978.

Gage, N. I. The yield of research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59( ), 229-235.

Gallup, G. H. "Of the public's attitudes toward the public schools." Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1978, 33-45.

Gillie, O. The great I.Q. fraud. Atlas World Press Review, February, 1979, 26-28.

Goodell, R. The french connection. The New York Times, August 26, 1979, 13; 20.

Goodlad, J. I. Can our schools get better? Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 60(5), 345-347.

Greeley, A. A novel proposal: teach 'em to read and write. Trenton Times, May 6, 1979, D3.

Hechinger, F. M. Schoolyard blues - the decline of public education. Saturday Review, January 29, 1979, 20-22.

Hyman, I. A. Crime and punishment: An analysis of punitiveness in current school discipline practices. Presidential address for the Division of School Psychology at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada, August 30, 1978.

Hyman, I. A. Will the real school psychologist please stand up: A struggle of jurisdictional imperialism. School Psychology Digest, 1979, VIII(2), (in press).

Jenkins, John. Whose fault is student loan default? Change, November, 1978, 44-45.

Maital, S. The nature of man in conventional microeconomic theory. Paper presented at Workshop on Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Management Science, University of Toronto, February 9, 1979.

Maital, S. and Maital, S. Time preference, delay of gratification and the intergenerational transmission of economic inequality: A behavioral theory of income distribution. I. O. Ashenfelter and W. Oates (Eds.), Essays in Labor Market Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1978.

National Institute of Education. The safe school study report to congress: Executive summary. National Institute of Education, 1977.

Nocera, Joseph. I am not a crook. Newsweek, December 19, 1977, 14-15.

Paying for schools and colleges. A For Foundation Report, 1976.

Saks, M. J. Social psychological contributions to a legislative subcommittee on organ and tissue transplants. American Psychologist, July, 1978, 33(7), 680-690.

Shanker, A. Where we stand. The New York Times, August 12, 1979, E7.

Weart, S. Scientists in power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.